REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of an Office Action dated January 28, 2008. Claims 5-21 remain pending in the application. In this response, Applicants have rewritten claim 13 in independent form to incorporate the subject matter of the base claim. Additionally, Applicants have amended claims 5 and 6. Support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification as originally filed, *inter alia*, on page 2, lines 12-15. New claims 15-21 are added. Support for new claims 15-21 may be found in the specification as originally filed, *inter alia*, in Figures 5-6 and on page 6, lines 4-5; page 9, line 10 – page 10, line 13; and page 21, line 2 – page 23, line 6. Claims 7-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Thus, claims 5-6 and 12-21 are currently pending and under consideration in the application.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Interview Summary

The Applicants and Applicants' representative sincerely appreciate the personal interview of June 24, 2008. During the interview, the Applicants' representative and Examiner Goloboy discussed the outstanding rejections. Applicants agree with the statements set forth in the PTO's Interview Summary.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite. In this response, Applicants have amended claims 13 and 14 as suggested by the PTO. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under § 112, second paragraph.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 3 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Japanese Patent Publication JP 2002265630 (hereafter JP '630). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v.*

Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). See generally MPEP § 2131.

Here, JP '630 fails to disclose a resinous material "wherein at least a part of an active end group of the fluororesin is chemically bonded with a part of the thermoplastic resin by kneading both the thermoplastic resin and fluororesin upon heating both the thermoplastic resin and the fluororesin to a temperature close to melting points of the thermoplastic resin and the fluororesin and upon applying a vacuum-suction to both the thermoplastic resin and the fluororesin" as recited in claim 6.

JP '630 discloses irradiating a fluororesin under vacuum and heat, but does not disclose a process of applying heat and vacuum-suction during kneading. See, JP '630 [0007], [0015]-[0016] and [0019]. Rather, JP '630 discloses a process that promotes "the crosslinking reaction" in a fluororesin, but does not result in the chemical bonding of the active end groups of the fluororesin with an atom forming part of the thermoplastic resin. Therefore, JP '630 does not disclose a resinous material where "at least a part of the active end groups of the fluororesin is chemically bonded with an atom forming part of the thermoplastic resin" as recited in claim 6.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under § 102.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 3 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,985,949 to Seguchi *et al.* in view of (hereafter "Seguchi") in view of Japanese Patent Publication 63-179965 (hereafter "JP '965") and Wicks, Coatings, in *Kirk-Othmer Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology*, Vol. 7, John Wiley & Sons, 2002, p. 90 (hereafter "Wicks"). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

The framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under §103 requires:

1. Determining the scope and content of the prior art;
2. Ascertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art;
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Teleflex, Inc. v. KSR Int'l Co., 127 S. Ct. 1727, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007); *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP §2143.03.

Here, Seguchi, JP '965, and Wicks, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a combination of a thermoplastic resin composition with a lubricating oil "wherein at least a part of an active end group of the fluororesin is chemically bonded with a part of the thermoplastic resin" as recited in claim 5.

Seguchi discloses "a product having reduced friction and improved abrasion resistance comprises a formed resin containing at least one fluorine-containing polymer which is exposed to ionizing radiation." Abstract. Seguchi fails to teach the combination of the lubricating oil in contact with the thermoplastic composition and fails to teach that a fluororesin is chemically bonded with a thermoplastic resin.

JP '965 actually discloses a lubricating oil incorporated into the resin composition "in the range of 3 to 15 weight % in relation to the whole composition." JP '965, pg. 5, lns. 9-19. However, JP '965 fails to teach that a fluororesin is chemically bonded with a thermoplastic resin.

Wicks discusses wetting between a metal substrate and a permanent coating, and does not teach or suggest any combination of resins or that a fluororesin is chemically bonded with a thermoplastic resin.

For at least this reason, Applicants submit that the outstanding rejection based upon the combination of Seguchi, JP '965, and Wicks has been overcome and ought to be withdrawn.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See MPEP 2143.03. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 12, which ultimately depends from independent claim 5, is also non-obvious at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 5.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection under § 103.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the PTO's indication, on page 4 of the Office Action, that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claim 13 to incorporate all of the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, claim 13 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Newly Added Claims

In this response, Applicants have added claims 15-21 which depend from claims 5, 6, or 12.

Applicants believe that claims 15-21 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from one of independent claims 5-6 and also because of the additional features recited in each claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing or a credit card payment form being unsigned, providing incorrect information resulting in a rejected credit card transaction, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith,

Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date June 30, 2008 By _____

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5540
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Paul D. Strain
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,369